LETTERS

TO THE

Rt. Hon. EDMUND BURKE.

By J. S.

[John Scott]

LONDON:

Printed in the Year 1783.

AC911. 1783. S38

LETTERS &c.

LETTER I.

To the Right Honourable EDMUND BURKE.

SIR,

GOVERNOR Johnſtone has ſo fully replied to the illiberal and unjuſtifiable abuſe which you beſtowed upon Mr. Haſtings on Monday, that I ſhall make no further obſervations upon it. It will not excite ſurpriſe in any man of the leaſt reflection, that you ſhould depreciate the character of the ſtateſman who has hitherto had ſo great a ſhare in preſerving our poſſeſſions in India, when he conſiders that for ſeven years you abuſed your noble friend Lord North, in the groſſeſt terms, becauſe he differed from you in politics; that you

3030665

accused Lord Cornwallis of sacrificing the lives of thousands in Virginia, whose quivering limbs you saw—*or seemed to see*, hanging upon every tree in that province; and that you would have prevented the return of Lord Rodney to the West-Indies, in 1782, because he had done his duty at St. Eustatius; nay, that you would have tried him by a Court Martial, because Count De Grasse had asserted, in his dispatches to France, that he had offered the British Admiral battle in 1781, which he thought proper to decline. With a knowledge of these facts before us, which the most sanguine of your friends can neither palliate nor deny, knowing too, that your relation Mr. William Burke, the Paymaster of his Majesty's forces in India, is the avowed agent of the Raja of Tanjore, we account from interested motives, as well as from the impetuosity of your temper, for the violence of your conduct to the Governor General.

But what offence have you received from the great body of the Company's civil and military servants, the Free Merchants, &c. who reside in Bengal, that you should attack them with so much severity? I will take upon me to assert, that the small fortune which I obtained in the course of fifteen years service in Bengal, (and I am positive

poſitive I can ſay the ſame of the fortunes of my cotemporaries,) was as honourably and as fairly acquired, as that which you may now or hereafter poſſeſs; and I aſſure you, Sir, I never acted either as agent to an Indian Raja, nor did I ever hold ſo uſeleſs, ſo unneceſſary, or ſo advantageous an appointment from the Eaſt-India Company, in the fifteen years I was in their ſervice, as that which the late Marquis of Rockingham beſtowed upon your Couſin Mr. William Burke laſt year. It is not impoſſible, but that one thouſand or fifteen hundred pounds of my little fortune, may be remitted home next year, by that mode which you have cenſured ſo ſeverely. Many of my friends may alſo have a ſhare of the remittance. I will therefore ſtate it fairly as it is, and I will even leave *you* to judge if there is any thing in the tranſaction we need to bluſh at. The Governor General and Council were obliged to borrow money for an inveſtment, to ſupply the European market, to prevent the manufactures ſtanding ſtill, and the diminution of the revenues. There were orders from the Company in force, that their ſervants in Bengal ſhould not draw upon them beyond a certain amount. The firſt idea therefore was to ſend home cargoes to be ſold on account of thoſe Gentlemen who advanced

money

money in Bengal. This scheme was certainly liable to many objections; these were foreseen, and the Supreme Council who had adopted the scheme on the 8th of April last, relinquished it on the 10th of May, for the more eligible mode of granting Bills on the Directors at one and two years sight, and sending the cargoes to Europe on the Company's account. The terms were as follow: That those who subscribed the money, should be allowed 8 per cent. interest (the legal interest of the country is 12 per cent.) from the time the cash was paid, to the day the Bills were granted; and the exchange was to be two shillings the current rupee. Now, Sir, is it possible that you can blame Mr. Hastings and the Supreme Council, who proposed those terms, or the Company's servants, who accepted them, and at the same time call General Richard Smith your Honourable friend, who actually proposed, on the 25th of September, 1769, in the hour of peace and tranquillity, to grant bills upon the Company at the rate of two shillings and three pence the current rupee, and 4 per cent. interest in England, till the time of payment, being above twelve per cent. more favourable to the bill-holders, and of course so much more disadvantageous to the Company, than the present remittance.

The

The propoſal of your Honourable Friend was not then accepted, though he very ſtrongly urged the propriety of it; but on the 23d of October following, at the diſtance of twenty-eight days, the ſcheme was again brought forward with the General's conſent and approbation, and accepted with this difference, that the bill-holders were to have but 3 inſtead of 4 per cent. intereſt in England, from 90 days ſight to the periods of payment, *and to be allowed* 8 *per cent. intereſt in Bengal, from the time the caſh was paid into the Company's treaſury, to the day the bills were granted*; the very circumſtance in Mr. Haſtings's remittance which appeared to ſtrike you with aſtoniſhment. Your Honourable Friend the General remitted above eighty-three thouſand pounds by the channel he had ſo ſtrongly adviſed the Council to adopt.

If you will be at the pains to read the letter which Mr. Francis (the Gentleman whom you intend to ſend out Governor General of Bengal) wrote to the Court of Directors on the 19th of November, 1781, you will find that he recommends it to them to authoriſe the Supreme Council to draw upon the Company at the rate of two ſhillings and one penny the current rupee; ſo that Mr. Haſtings and his Council, after all, muſt

muſt be allowed the merit of getting money upon better terms than Mr. Francis had recommended, as equitable for one party to offer, and the other to accept.

J. S.

April 28th,
1783.

LETTER II.

To the Right Honourable EDMUND BURKE.

SIR,

YOUR candid, humane, and rational defence of Mr. Powell and Mr. Bembridge gave me great pleaſure. The reſentment which you expreſſed, when the words "enormous offenders" were applied to men *unconvicted of any crime*, was manly and juſt. But while I applaud your interpoſition in favour of Mr. Powell, becauſe *delinquency has not been proved againſt him*, becauſe it would be *hard to condemn a man from ex parte evidence*, what excuſe can be offered for your ungenerous treatment of the Governor General of Bengal? I would aſk you, Sir, if that gentleman has been heard in his defence? I would aſk you, what crime has he committed, that you ſhould

call

call him, upon all occaſions, " a moſt notorious delinquent?" You have, it is true, repeatedly pledged yourſelf to prove his delinquency; but when Governor Johnſtone, on Monday laſt, ſtated the indecency and impropriety of your abuſe of a man *unconvicted of any offence*, and expreſſed the readineſs of Mr. Haſtings's friends to reply to any charge you could bring forward, you directed the Clerk to read the reſolutions of the Houſe of Commons, as your juſtification for having uſed ſuch harſh and unwarrantable expreſſions.

I will ſuppoſe for once, that thoſe reſolutions had not paſſed when there were but 28 Members in the Houſe, that the Rockingham party was not in the zenith of its power at the time, and that no previous converſation had been held between Sir Adam Ferguſon, General Richard Smith, and yourſelf, ſtill I am at a loſs to conceive, how theſe reſolutions juſtify you, in calling Mr. Haſtings a "notorious offender." They condemn the Court of Directors, Mr. Haſtings, and Mr. Hornby, for *their political conduct*; and as they ſtood originally, the Govenor General was ſaid to have acted, in a certain inſtance, from an "intereſted partiality to the Vizier." Mr. Powys objected to the word " intereſted," thinking it conveyed an idea of corruption on the part of Mr. Haſtings. Such an idea was inſtantly

difclaimed, and the word "interefted" was changed to "unreafonable:" admitting, therefore, that the refolutions were well founded, I muft ftill infift upon it, that Mr. Haftings was never accufed of delinquency by the Secret Committee. I am, however, of opinion, that the refolutions, as far as they affect Mr. Haftings, have been fully and fairly refuted.

Has the Select Committee proved Mr. Haftings guilty of delinquency? Certainly they have not, and I refer you to the Letters of "Detector" for a complete and fatisfactory reply to every infinuation contained in them. You have threatened us with a report that is yet to come forward. I underftand it is entirely confined to the trade of India. Whenever you produce a charge, it fhall be anfwered; but I earneftly intreat you, Sir, to fhew that candour, fairnefs, and decency to the Governor General of Bengal, which you think due to Meffrs. Powell and Bembridge; do not in future call Mr. Haftings a "notorious offender," until you have proved him one.

It is above a year ago, fince you told Major Scott there was a direct charge of corruption againft Mr. Haftings; but although you were preffed to bring it forwards, I have heard no more of it.

At

At the eve of an election Mr. Sulivan and Sir William James were ſaid to have falſified the records of the Company. A letter was written to ſeveral Proprietors, which was ſuſpected to come from the Treaſury, in which the moſt unwarrantable liberties were taken with the characters of Gentlemen "*unconvicted of any offence*;" but *they* carried their election, and we have heard no more of falſified Records.

May 3, 1783. J. S.

LETTER III.

To the Right Honourable EDMUND BURKE.

SIR,

IN a letter, which I did myſelf the honour to addreſs to you a few days ago, I flatter myſelf I proved, that Mr. Haſtings, in a ſeaſon of war and diſtreſs, had negociated a remittance more advantageous for the Eaſt-India Company, by above 12 per cent. than that which General Richard

Smith recommended in the time of peace and tranquillity. Permit me now to compare the conduct of Mr. Haſtings, and your honourable friend, in another inſtance; and I truſt, I ſhall be able to convince you, that even in this caſe, Mr. Haſtings has been more ſcrupulouſly attentive to the orders of the Company, than the General: if I can do this, I am ſure you will retract the cenſure that you have already paſſed upon the Governor General, ſince you have been more than commonly warm and eloquent, in defence of your honourable friend, when his conduct has been under diſcuſſion, and the General has not neglected to remind us repeatedly of "the uniform tenor of his actions," "his "conſcious integrity," "and the regard he "has ever paid to his own honour." Theſe declarations you may find recorded, in almoſt every letter he wrote, when he filled a public character in India.

In the month of October, 1781, the Vizier and his Miniſters offered Mr. Haſtings the ſum of ten lacks of rupees, which he accepted. So much of it as he then received, he expended in the public ſervice. He informed the Directors he had done ſo; he told them, that the remainder ſhould be paid into their Treaſury, as ſoon as he received it, and to them he left the diſpoſal of his money.

About

About the middle of the year 1767, his Majeſty Shaw Allum made General Richard Smith a preſent of two lacks of rupees. The General took the caſh, but gave his bond and ſecurity to the Council to refund it, provided the Directors would not permit him to retain it for his own uſe.

In January, 1768, the General paid Sujah Dowlah a viſit at Fyzabad. The cuſtomary preſents of horſes, clothes, &c. were made by him to the Vizier, and preſents ſuitable to the General's rank and ſtation were received by him in return. In the courſe of the viſit, in order to ſhew the world their friendly diſpoſitions to each other, the General preſented Sujah Dowlah with *his hat*, and received in return *the turban* of the Vizier, but refuſed to accept a preſent of two lacks of rupees, which, as he ſays, the Vizier repeatedly preſſed upon him.

In June, 1769, a letter was received from the Directors, by the Council of Bengal, in which they ſay, they cannot permit General Smith to retain the preſent the King had made him, becauſe it is univerſally known, his Majeſty is leſs able than any Prince in Indoſtan to make preſents; but ſhould Sujah Dowlah renew his offers, they have no objection to his receiving that ſum from him. This paragraph was ſent to the General at Allahabad.

On

On the 7th of September, 1769, the General, being then in Calcutta, produced to the Council two letters, authenticated as tranflations from the originals, by the fignature of Mr. C. W. Boughton Rous, the one from the King, the other from Sujah Dowlah. The latter contained in fubftance, that Sujah Dowlah had offered the General two lacks of rupees fome time ago, which the General would not accept; he adds, he is very happy to find there will be no impropriety in his accepting that fum now, as the Directors have given their confent, and he offers to repay to the King the two lacks which his Majefty had given to the General two years before. This letter was receiv-ed the 24th of June, 1769.

The letter from the King expreffes furprize and concern at the idea of receiving back what he had once given away; and concludes by faying, that Sujah Dowlah had paid to the Royal Treafury the two lacks of rupees which his Majefty had given to the General in 1767.

This letter was received the 3d of July, 1769. Thefe papers being read and entered, the Council delivered to General Smith his bond and the bonds of his fecurities; and thus was the bufinefs adjufted.

Now, Sir, from this authentic ftatement,

you

you will perceive how differently Mr. Haſtings and your honourable friend have acted—not that I mean to impute the ſmalleſt degree of blame to the latter, very far from it; but Mr. Haſtings has certainly been more obſervant of the Company's orders, which were equally binding on both. Your honourable friend actually received the caſh; he had the advantage of employing it above two years, when the common intereſt at the time was 12 per cent. ſo that if he had refunded the original ſum, the intereſt would have been above 6000l. to him; but as Sujah Dowlah ſettled the buſineſs with the King, and the General had not a rupee to pay back, and as he was enabled to remit at a very advantageous exchange, I think I may fairly ſtate the value of the preſent at thirty-three thouſand pounds.

Mr. Haſtings effectually precluded himſelf from every poſſibility of advantage for the preſent, by paying in the money as faſt as he received it, and leaving the entire diſpoſal of principal and intereſt to the pleaſure of the Court of Directors.

I truſt, Sir, when you next mention this circumſtance, you will recollect, how your honourable friend acted in a ſituation ſomething ſimilar, and that you will give Mr.

Haſtings

Haſtings the credit which is due to him for his diſintereſtedneſs.

May 9, 1783. J. S.

P. S. Your honourable friend did not deem it neceſſary to account for any trifling preſents he received during his command; for in looking over the 5th Report of your Select Committee, I find that General Richard Smith received about ſixteen thouſand pounds ſterling from the Company, being the amount of preſents he had made in his publick character; but it did not occur to him to bring to account the value of the horſes, clothes, jewels, &c. &c. which he received in return.

LETTER IV.

To the Right Honourable EDMUND BURKE.

SIR,

IT has been very generally ſaid, for ſome time paſt, that you mean, during the preſent Seſſion of Parliament, to bring in a Bill

Bill of Regulation for India, and that one object of that Bill will be to appoint Mr. Francis, Governor General of Bengal, General Richard Smith, ſecond in Council, and Commander in Chief, Mr. Dudley Long, and Mr. William Burke, 4th and 5th Members of the Adminiſtration. By this arrangement, Mr. Haſtings, Sir Eyre Coote, Mr. Wheler, and Mr. Macpherſon, are to be removed, and Mr. Stables to remain, I preſume in compliment to his connection with your *new friends*, though I muſt admit it would be difficult to find a plea for removing him, as we have no official intelligence of his arrival in Bengal. With what propriety you can propoſe to recal Mr. Macpherſon, for having acted as Agent to the Nabob of the Carnatic, and appoint in his room your couſin, Mr. William Burke, who is at this moment the avowed Agent of the Raja of Tanjore, I cannot comprehend. Mr. William Burke may have great merit, but I believe, Sir, he is only known in Leadenhall-ſtreet, as one of thoſe gentlemen who ſpeculated very deeply in India Stock ſome years ago, and ſmarted ſeverely for his ſpeculation. Mr. Long has never been employed in the Company's ſervice. This will be an objection to ſome, and a recom-

mendation to thofe who think we are all *rotten to the core.*

Your honourable friend, Mr. Richard Smith, is an old fervant of the Company; his merits or demerits, as a public man, may be found upon the Company's records.

If I am not mifinformed, he went firft to India about the year 1753, but not in a military character, though his active and afpiring mind foon led him into the army. He ferved about 10 years on the Madras eftablifhment, with reputation, but without having had any very particular opportunities of diftinguifhing himfelf. He refigned the fervice with the rank of Captain early in 1763, and from that day never faw a fhot fired by an enemy. He was promoted to the rank of a Major by the Court of Directors while on his paffage to England, and he arrived at a time when party difputes ran very high in Leadenhall-ftreet. He was enabled to ferve the late Lord Clive very effentially, by purchafing India Stock, and fplitting votes. In return, his Lordfhip procured for him a very high military command in Bengal, and the rank of Colonel in his Majefty's fervice in India.

The General arrived in Calcutta the 1ft of May, 1765. Sujah Dowlah furrendered himfelf to General Carnae very foon after,

and

and tranquillity was perfectly reſtored. In 1766, your honourable friend commanded an army of obſervation, which the Mahrattas never ventured to approach; and on the 27th of January, 1767, he ſucceeded to the ſtations of Commander in Chief, and third Member of the Adminiſtration. On the 23d of November, 1769, he reſigned the ſervice, having been but four years and ſeven months in Bengal, and two years and ten months only of that time in the command of the army: ſo that, in fact, General Smith has not been longer in the Company's ſervice, calculating the time he was employed both at Madras and in Bengal, than Major John Scott, whoſe promotion was deemed of conſequence enough to be inſerted in one of your Reports.

Your honourable friend's declarations of diſintereſtedneſs, uniformity of conduct, &c. may be found in almoſt every minute, and in every letter he wrote, while in Bengal: yet he acknowledges to Mr. Verelſt, Feb. 8, 1768, that he was concerned in the attempt to purchaſe all the cotton imported into Bengal from Surat; that he had made advances for cloths at the Aurungs; that he had purchaſed goods, at the Company's expence, in Calcutta; and that he had obtained an excluſive privilege for making ſaltpetre in

 Oude,

Oude. He aſſigns, as a reaſon for entering into commercial concerns, the ſcantineſs of his allowances from the Company, and he adds, that he gained nothing by cotton; that he divided the profits of his trade in cloths, &c. amongſt the gentlemen of his family; that he ſoon relinquiſhed his ſaltpetre Perwannah, and that he ſaw the impropriety of a Commander in Chief being concerned in trade. Although the honourable General may be perfectly ſincere, and doubtleſs he is ſo, in his aſſertions to Mr. Verelſt, yet very ſerious conſequences reſulted from Mr. Bolt's endeavours to participate in the trade of ſaltpetre, which he knew to be very advantageous. The violence, with which his Gomaſtahs were treated, the ſeizure of his perſon, and ſending him by force to England, are clearly imputable to your honourable friend, and theſe acts occaſioned the eſtabliſhment of the Supreme Court of Judicature. The meaſure of keeping above a third of our army at Allahabad, contrary to the recommendation of Lord Clive at his departure from Bengal, a meaſure which General Smith repreſented to the Committee as abſolutely neceſſary, the importation of *good Sonaut Rupees* for the payment of the troops (though it is well known they were paid in a baſer coin), the expenſive and

and uſeleſs deputation of the Sujah Dowlah in 1768, the propoſition made by the honourable General on the 25th day of September, 1769, for granting bills upon the Directors, againſt their poſitive orders, the ſubſequent adoption of that propoſition to ſo conſiderable an amount, to which amount he ſo largely contributed; theſe meaſures, which the records of the Eaſt India Company will prove, did actually originate with your honourable friend, brought ſuch diſtreſs upon the Company in England, that they were obliged to petition Parliament for aſſiſtance, and the conſequence was, to uſe your own language, "Relief "and reformation went hand in hand." The Regulating Act paſſed—To that act the honourable General ſays, we owe all our misfortunes—I perfectly agree with him—but I add, that to him we owe that act.

The honourable General ſerved the Company about fifteen years. He has retired from their ſervice almoſt fourteen years, and I think it highly probable, that he has not the moſt diſtant idea of returning to it again. But as you have very wiſely pointed out the neceſſity of examining into the merits of every man, who, having been once employed in India, aſpires to the elevated ſtation

ſtation of a Member of the Supreme Council in Bengal, you will, I am ſure, be obliged to me, for any authentic information I may convey to you reſpecting the honourable General, provided (which however I do not believe) you do really intend to propoſe him as one of the Members of your new arrangement.

The public tranſactions, in which Mr. Francis has been concerned, are ſo generally known, that it will be needleſs for me to ſay a ſyllable about them.

May 21*ſt*, 1783. J. S.

LETTER V.

To the Right Honourable EDMUND BURKE.

SIR,

I Can with truth aſſure you, that no man living more ſincerely applauds than I do the equitable reſolution of the Houſe of Commons on Wedneſday laſt, and I earneſtly hope that what has already paſſed reſpecting two gentlemen

gentlemen, who, I truſt, have been mo[illegible] imprudent than guilty, will not prejudice them in the public opinion. There were parts of your Speech which affected me, and they certainly made an impreſſion upon the Houſe: but while I honour your humanity in one inſtance, let me conjure you to exerciſe your juſtice at leaſt, if not your humanity, in another. Two gentlemen of conſiderable rank in life, and a Clerk in office, have been repreſented as having committed a fraud; the fact is, no fraud has been committed. Mr. Sulivan and Sir William James can and will defend themſelves; but Mr. Wilks, in conſequence of a long and painful illneſs, brought upon him by intenſe application to buſineſs, is really that timid man in office whom you deſcribed Mr. Powell to be. The determination of the buſineſs to which I allude has been put off for another week; and, in order to prevent the malicious and envious part of mankind (and Lord John Cavendiſh has juſtly ſaid, there are too many who come under that deſcription) from ſuppoſing that gentlemen, who have ſerved their country ably, faithfully, and ſucceſsfully, both at home and abroad, have been guilty of a fraud, I muſt ſtate the tranſaction very ſhortly, premiſing, however, that the whole of this trifling buſineſs

is

is fully elucidated by "Detector," and in a "few observations" which have been very generally read.

In July 1781, two Acts of Parliament, respecting India, received the Royal Assent. On the 2d of August they were received by Mr. Wilks at the India House from Mr. Strahan, the King's Printer. The next day (as Mr. Wilks has sworn) he packed up five of each in a box, and they were carried by him to the Admiralty, to be sent to Bengal by the Agamemnon and Prothee; two sail of the line, which were intended to proceed in the most secret manner to reinforce Sir Edward Hughes, at a moment when we trembled for our existence in India. The Chairman and his Deputy were in the Secret, but every circumstance of the dispatch was concealed from the Directors, and from the Captains of the men of war. The letter to Bengal was upon points of very great public importance. You very fully proved in your first Report of last year, that the regular official mode of transmitting Acts of Parliament is from the Court of Directors; nay, you have insinuated, that any other mode of transmission might be dangerous. Admitting, as I do, this fact, is it surprising that Mr. Wilks, *Clerk to the Secret Committee*, with so much important business on his hands,

hands, forgot to inſert, in the letter of the 3d of Auguſt, that he had tranſmitted the Acts? though there is not any doubt of his having mentioned them in the liſt of packets in this manner, "No. 10 and 11, Copies of Acts of Parliament."

The ſhips ſailed, fell in with Admiral Darby, returned with him to Torbay. The ſcheme was given up, and the packets were received back by Mr. Wilks from the Admiralty on the 21ſt of November: ſo that one fact is incontrovertible, whether the acts were ſent or not, no injury has been ſuſtained, *becauſe the ſhips did not proceed.* Now, Sir, I come to Mr. Wilks's crime, ſtiled a fraud by the honourable General. The Select Committee, in December 1781, wanted to know what had been done reſpecting the tranſmiſſion of the acts, and ordered all the papers from the India Houſe before them. Mr. Wilks told Mr. Sulivan, he had ſent the acts on board the Agamemnon. Mr. Sulivan called for the letter, obſerved there was no mention of their tranſmiſſion. Mr. Wilks went home, altered the letter, ſo as to make it correſpond with the ſtrict matter of fact; but, as he has ſolemnly ſworn, without any order from any perſon, and that he never communicated the circumſtance either to

Mr. Sulivan or Sir William James. Here, Sir, is the extent of Mr. Wilks's offence—He has ſworn to it. He calls the act a moſt unwarrantable one himſelf, and he ſubmitted to the mercy and the juſtice of the Select Committee. That he acted imprudently, nay fooliſhly, I will allow; but the tranſaction could not injure any human being; and would you, Sir, with your boaſted humanity, damn a man for ever in this world, for ſuch an act of folly?

With reſpect to Mr. Sulivan and Sir William James, it will appear that they could have no view or intereſt in delaying the tranſmiſſion of the Acts; that by ſending them in a ſecret diſpatch from themſelves, they performed an Act of ſupererogation at leaſt, ſince you have proved that the regular channel of tranſmiſſion is from the Court of Directors; and they were regularly ſent by the Trial on the 29th of Auguſt, though from various accidents, for which neither Sir William James nor Mr. Sulivan are accountable, ſhe did not finally ſail from Ireland till the 12th of February, 1782.

Now, Sir, I come to the fault which is excluſively Mr. Sulivan's. He had promiſed your Committee to ſend orders to Bengal for certain ſums to be paid to the Patna

Patna Magiſtrates. In the extreme hurry of important buſineſs, when the Trial was diſpatched, he forgot to bring the ſubject forward. The veſſel, however, returned. He confeſſed his neglect to you, but he told you it was of no conſequence, as the Trial had returned, and the order for compenſation ſhould go. It was ſent. The Acts, &c. &c. all arrived in Calcutta the 7th of July, 1782, in the Trial—being in fact the firſt arrival from England in Calcutta, either by land or ſea, from the Day the Acts received the Royal Aſſent, and within a year of their paſſing; which ſurely was not any conſiderable Delay, during an extenſive and complicated war.

Did you, Sir, ſhew humanity to Mr. Sulivan; nay, did you ſhew juſtice to him? Were not reſolutions of cenſure brought forward by your Committee? Were they not paſſed? Did not Mr. Sulivan petition to be heard in his defence? Was he allowed this reaſonable indulgence? Did you not ſay, that the Houſe might come to any reſolution, but unleſs further proceedings were held, Mr. Sulivan had no right to be heard? Was he not obliged to ſubmit, and was not the reſolution of cenſure againſt him, of laſt year, called for by you at the very eve of an election, and read to the

Houſe on the day the 7th Report of your Committee was preſented. Nay, further, is not your brother, Mr. Richard Burke, ſuppoſed to be the perſon who authoriſed letters to be ſent from the Treaſury in which Mr. Sulivan and Sir William James are pointed at as having incurred the juſt cenſure of Parliament. I can produce one of theſe curious epiſtles, and can bring preſumptive evidence at leaſt of its having been ſent from the Treaſury. Your brother, if he did not act from himſelf in the affair, beſt knows by whoſe order he interfered as a public man in an Eaſt-India election. I am not apt, I hope, to mention matters of ſuch conſequence looſely or lightly, and the tranſaction ought to be ſtrictly enquired into. Where is the juſtice, or the humanity of ſuch proceeding? The world well knows your hatred to Mr. Haſtings, that you ſtand pledged to God, the Houſe of Commons, and your country, to prove that Gentleman a moſt notorious delinquent; but ſurely, Sir, you ought not to extend your hatred and your prejudices to every perſon with whom Mr. Haſtings is connected.

I hope and truſt, after what has paſſed lately, that Mr. Haſtings's character will be ſpared, until a *ſpecific charge* ſhall be preferred againſt him. The moment that ap-

pears,

pears, I pledge myſelf to God and my country, for I am not honoured with a ſeat in the Houſe of Commons, to anſwer it fully, fairly, and I hope ſatisfactorily.

May 24th, 1783. J. S.

LETTER VI.

To the Right Honourable EDMUND BURKE.

SIR,

I VERY ſincerely congratulate you on the favourable intelligence received from Bengal by the Lively, and I have the pleaſure to inform you, that the Patna Magiſtrate, whoſe ghoſt you ſaw about thirteen months ago, hovering over that aſſembly which betrays ſuch ſtrong ſigns of impatience whenever you addreſs them, is alive, in health, and releaſed from his confinement. I forbear to ſay a ſyllable of the concluſion of Mr. Sulivan's buſineſs; but I truſt, as you have failed both in your attempts to keep that gentleman out of the direction, or to

remove

remove him from it after he got in, as you alſo dropped your enquiry into Lord Rodney's conduct, and accuſed Lord Cornwallis without a cauſe. that you will be a little more cautious how you attack deſerving individuals in future.

Were I, Sir, as anxious to expoſe the inconſiſtency of your conduct, as you are to criminate every man connected with Mr. Haſtings, I ſhould remark upon the extraordinary aſſertion you made in the Houſe of Commons relative to the late unfortunate Mr. Powell. You ſaid, that you reſtored him to his office, becauſe that reſtoration was abſolutely neceſſary for conducting the public buſineſs, and you dwelt very forcibly upon this circumſtance; yet you have ſworn before the Coroner, that the unhappy man was in a ſtate of inſanity from the moment the *late Lords* of the Treaſury commenced a proſecution againſt him.

But ſurely your conduct with reſpect to Mr. Haſtings is extraordinary and unpardonable.—I attribute the unworthy treatment which that gentleman met with laſt year, to the violence of your paſſions, and to your influence with the Rockingham Adminiſtration. I have heard, and from tolerable authority too, that the late Marquis abſolutely threatened to break up the Miniſtry

if Mr. Haſtings was not removed. The nation, thank God, has at laſt recovered its ſenſes. I have repeatedly pointed out to the public the manner in which the Reſolution to remove Mr. Haſtings was carried; but as he has loudly complained of the injuſtice done to him, as he very properly diſclaimed all reſponſibility until ſomething deciſive ſhould be done, previous to his knowledge of the interference of the Court of Proprietors, I do think the ſubject worthy the conſideration of every honeſt, independent man in this kingdom.

Two Committees had ſat for a conſiderable time upon India affairs; the one to enquire into the cauſe of the war in the Carnatic, the other to take into conſideration the adminiſtration of juſtice in Bengal. The former brought into the Houſe forty-four Reſolutions, which condemned the conduct of the Court of Directors, Mr. Haſtings and Mr. Hornby, previous to any reſolutions relative to the affairs of the Carnatic. The latter, after having diſpoſed of Sir Elijah Impey, and having cenſured Mr. Haſtings for an act of great wiſdom, prudence, and neceſſity, turned their whole attention to perſonal matters: I mean to a critical examination of every act of Mr. Haſtings's Adminiſtration, and to the appointment of Mr. John Mac-

pherſon

pherſon to the Supreme Council. Theſe occurrences took place during the Rockingham Adminiſtration. The views of General Smith and Mr. Dudley Long to fill up two of the places they were taking ſo much pains to vacate, were publicly mentioned, God knows with what truth; and it was further ſaid, Sir, that you expected the ſtation of a member of the Supreme Council for your Couſin, Mr. William Burke, the Tanjore agent, and Paymaſter of his Majeſty's forces in India. Theſe, probably, may be ſtories induſtriouſly circulated with a view to leſſen the dignity of your proceedings; for I believe it will be found that General Smith, Mr. Long, and Mr. Burke, form a majority of members preſent upon almoſt every occaſion, and your joint and ſeparate abilities are well known. It would not degrade Mr. Smith, Mr. Long, and Mr. Burke, if they were to ſtep forwards, and honeſtly avow that they have no views of filling up any ſtations in India, either in their own perſons, or by promoting their near relations;---the public would then have ſome confidence in your proceedings.

The meaſure of removing Mr. Haſtings was eaſily determined; but the difficult point was, how it ſhould be done. Had it been by bill, that gentleman's friends muſt have been heard

heard in his defence. Such a proceeding muſt have opened the eyes of a deluded public. It was therefore agreed to effect his removal by a parliamentary manœuvre. Your preſent noble friend, Lord North, had fled the field. The honeſt and independent country gentlemen, wearied with the American war, and having a confidence in his Majeſty's Miniſters, did not interfere, but had generally retired to their counties. Under theſe circumſtances a reſolution was brought in, and paſſed without difficulty in a very thin Houſe, "that it was the duty of the Court "of Directors to remove Mr. Haſtings." You may now, perhaps recollect, (for *you* have had *ſome cauſe* to be humbled) though your pride and your conſequence would not at that time allow you to liſten to a friend of Lord Rodney, how pointedly Governor Johnſtone ſpoke on that occaſion. He told you, if you were determined to remove Mr. Haſtings, you muſt do it conſtitutionally, you muſt do it by Bill; that the Proprietors would interfere, unleſs they ſhould be of the ſame opinion with the Houſe of Commons. I well recollect how you declaimed upon that occaſion, "that the Proprietors had nothing to do with Mr. Haſtings;" who would dare to oppoſe a Reſolution of that Houſe, &c. &c. J. S.

May 31*ſt*, 1783.

LETTER VII.

To the Right Honourable EDMUND BURKE.

SIR,

AS the proceedings of the India-Houſe during the ſummer receſs are ſo well known, it will be ſufficient barely to obſerve that Mr. Haſtings was continued in that office from which 13 of the Directors wanted to remove him, by a majority of above ſix to one of his reſpectable conſtituents. Many of the firſt and beſt characters in England actually came up from diſtant counties, without ſollicitation, to ballot in his favour.

You may remember, that on the firſt mention of this tranſaction in Parliament, the Lord Advocate avowed his intention to propoſe the removal of Mr. Haſtings by Bill. You perfectly agreed with him, and took that opportunity of accuſing the Governor General of delinquency. The Lord Advocate, however, inſtantly diſclaimed every idea of delinquency, and declared, that all he wanted or expected to prove to the Houſe

was,

was, the expediency of removing Mr. Haſtings. When Mr. T. Pitt earneſtly entreated the Houſe to proceed with temper and with caution, and was pleaſed to mention Mr. Haſtings's character with that degree of reſpect with which it is univerſally ſpoken of, except by thoſe who have an intereſt in depreciating it. What was your reply? That he was a moſt notorious delinquent, and you pledged yourſelf to God, to that Houſe, and your country, to prove your aſſertion; that you oppoſed your character to the Governor General's, &c. &c.

This ſolemn declaration was made early at the month of December, in a full Houſe; and I am now writing to you on the 4th of June, at a time, as Mr. Fox has ſaid, "when "it is impoſſible to compel or procure an "attendance." To this day we have not heard a ſylable of Mr. Haſtings's delinquency. How, Sir, can you anſwer to God, your country, and the Houſe of Commons, for ſpeaking, as you have done, of a man, whoſe public and private character is ſo ſuperior to your own, unleſs you had intended to bring forward your proofs. Was it neceſſary, Sir, with the advantage of having all the Company's records to reſort to, with the additional aſſiſtance of that "*quarto volume*," from whence, as you told

Major Scott, in the month of May, 1782, you had diſcovered "a direct charge of cor-"ruption againſt Mr. Haſtings," and with the opportunity of examining every man who has ſerved in India, with the labour, the induſtry, and the abilities of your Honourable Friend the General, ſo powerfully exerted, in conjunction with your own; with all theſe advantages operating againſt an abſent, unconnected individual; was it, I ſay, neceſſary, Sir, that you ſhould wait until, by the confeſſion of his Majeſty's Miniſters, "an attendance cannot be pro-"cured," before you bring forward a ſingle charge of delinquency? What will the world think of your juſtice? In the month of December, you aſſert, "That Mr. Haſtings "is a moſt notorious delinquent; that you "will prove him one, &c." A reaſonable man would ſuppoſe the proof was at that moment in your pocket, in your houſe, or, at leaſt, in your favourite Committee-room, and that it would have been ſpeedily produced, in conformity to ſo ſolemn a pledge. So far, however, from this being the caſe, the truth is, that, from that time to this, we have heard nothing on the ſubject, though ſix months have elapſed, except unmeaning declamation, whenever Mr. Haſtings's name has been mentioned, which, if it proves any

thing,

thing, proves your invincible prejudices. Do not ſuppoſe, Sir, that by fairly ſtating the injuſtice of your proceeding, I mean to ſhrink from any accuſation you can bring forward. In God's name, produce your charge of corruption, and although, as his Majeſty's Miniſters have told us, an attendance cannot be procured, it ſhall be completely anſwered.

A report has lately prevailed, that, although an attendance cannot be procured at this advanced ſeaſon of the year, his Majeſty's Miniſters mean to bring forward a bill for the change of our Government in India. Mr. Fox has ſtated, that every perſon who has read the Lively's diſpatches, muſt ſee the neceſſity of ſomething being done. I have read them with great attention, and they convey to my mind the fulleſt conviction of the integrity, the ability, and the ſucceſsful exertions of the Government of Bengal. It is true, indeed, Mr. Haſtings hath, with as much ſpirit as propriety, pointed out the neceſſity either of confirming or removing him, that the public intereſts might not continue to ſuffer from the vote of the 28th of May, 1782. Will his Majeſty's Miniſters, at this advanced ſeaſon of the year, when an attendance in Parliament cannot be procured, bring in a Bill

to

to remove Mr. Haſtings, againſt the declared ſenſe of the Eaſt-India Company, and againſt the ſenſe of the nation at large, becauſe you have aſſerted what you have ſo often been called upon, though in vain, to prove, or becauſe Mr. Haſtings, like a man, has avowed that he will not be reſponſible for any fatal conſequences that may happen in India from the meaſures purſued laſt year in England? I have ſo great a reſpect for the honourable Members who compoſe the preſent Cabinet, and ſo high an opinion of their juſtice and their wiſdom, that I am convinced they never will adopt a ſyſtem which is to deſtroy the preſent harmony and exertion of the Government of Bengal, without a very full diſcuſſion in the great Council of the Nation, of the advantages and diſadvantages that would reſult from a change of men at this critical juncture. Such a diſcuſſion is impoſſible at a ſeaſon when an attendance cannot be procured.

A few words only relative to your Committee.

I cannot bring myſelf to believe, that General Richard Smith, or Mr. Long, have the moſt diſtant views of ſucceeding to appointments in India; and I truſt and believe you do not mean to propoſe your relation, Mr. William Burke, the agent to the Raja of

Tanjore,

Tanjore, and the Pay-Maſter of his Majeſties forces in India, to be a Supreme Counſellor in the room of Mr. John Macpherſon. If ſuch ideas, however, had not gone abroad for many months, I ſhould not preſume to mention them; and I am convinced his Majeſty's preſent Miniſters, whenever they may think proper to take the appointments of Governors and Counſellors from the Eaſt-India Company, will at leaſt allow the Proprietors the liberty of objecting to ſuch Gentlemen, as (however worthy and reſpectable their characters may be) they ſhall not approve of.

J. S.

June 4th, 1783.

LETTER VIII.

To the Right Honourable EDMUND BURKE.

SIR,

WHEN I ſtated in my laſt letter, that Mr. Haſtings had, with as much ſpirit as propriety, pointed out the neceſſity either of confirming or removing him, I by no means meant to imply that any further confir-

confirmation was now wanted. The Court of Proprietors, his conftituents, confirmed him in his government, by the greateft majority that ever appeared upon any public queftion at the India-Houfe: — but Mr. Haftings, on the 8th November, 1782, when he difclaimed all refponfibility until he fhould be confirmed by a decided act of his employers, was ignorant of the generous and honourable interpofition of the Proprietors, either on the 19th June, or 31ft October. Intelligence of the firft event arrived in Calcutta on the 12th December, and was attended with very beneficial effects to the public interefts.

I mention this circumftance, to obviate any opinions that may be formed of the abfolute neceffity of doing fomething decifive by Bill in relation to India, at a time when an attendance cannot be procured in the Houfe of Commons.

I am convinced, his Majefty's prefent Minifters, when they maturely weigh the great importance of the fubject, and the long difcuffion it muft neceffarily bring on in both Houfes, will poftpone any intention they may have formed of bringing in a Bill of Regulation for India at this advanced feafon of the year.

June 6, 1783. J. S.